

## **Instructions to SDEIS lead agency technical reviewers**

Attached is a technical study prepared for the Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Supplemental Draft EIS (SDEIS). The technical studies are the substantive foundation for the SDEIS. You have been asked to review this study because of your knowledge of this subject and the project. **Please** read and follow these instructions carefully.

**The basic purpose of the SDEIS, and the supporting technical studies, is to provide an update from the Draft EIS on what is new or changed.** Information that has not changed generally should not be included. As a supplement to the Draft EIS the technical studies for each subject will follow the same approach and level of analysis. This means supplemental technical studies should:

- Follow the same organization and structure as the Draft EIS technical study (you may need to refer back to the technical study from the Draft EIS during your review.)
  - Include updates to the affected environment where conditions relevant to the analysis have changed.
  - Evaluate the June 30, 2005 plan sets. All alternatives and project features should be evaluated at the same level of detail.
  - Evaluate new project features at the same level of detail as in the Draft EIS.
  - Evaluate construction approaches at the same general level of detail as construction was evaluated in the Draft EIS.
1. Use the comment form provided. All draft materials are distributed as hard copies or as PDF files. Spreadsheet forms for each technical study will be provided for you to note your comments. All drafts are formatted with page and line numbers. Note these on the comment form in the columns provided to help us locate the subject of your comment. This will also make it easier to compare and consolidate comments from multiple reviewers.

**Assign a priority to each comment:** To facilitate our review each comment one of these three priorities:

1. **Critical issue requiring inter-agency discussion**
  2. Factual or substantive error or issue that should be corrected prior to publication
  3. Editorial suggestion to improve readability or other idea
2. Make substantive, not editorial, comments. As a reviewer you should consider:
    - a. Is the information factually correct?
    - b. Is the analysis complete and at the appropriate level of detail?
    - c. Can it be clearly understood?

You are not asked to become the author or editor. Comments that make re-writes without a clear explanation of why the revision is needed will not be addressed. Please note these reports are going to the editor after we incorporate your comments.

3. **Comments MUST be returned to your coordinator for consolidation by the stated due date.** Ask your coordinator if you have any questions. The coordinators are:
  - a. FHWA – Mary Gray (360) 753-9487
  - b. WSDOT – Margaret Kucharski (206) 382-6356
  - c. SDOT – Chuck Kirchner (206) 233-0093